UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,593	10/21/1999	LEONARD CORNING LAHEY	B09-99-028	5731

7590 11/26/2002

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DR.
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER	
BOYCE, ANDRE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/422,593	LAHEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre Boyce	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 September 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on *03 September 2002* is: a)☒ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Non-Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed September 3, 2002. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9-11, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 33, and 35-37 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are pending.

2. The previously pending objections to the drawings has been withdrawn.

The previously pending objection to the abstract has been withdrawn.

The previously pending objection to claim 1 has been withdrawn.

The previously pending rejections under 35 USC § 112 have been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-30, and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (USPN 5,964,156), in view of Smith et al (USPN 5,790,790).

As per claim 1, Smith et al '156 disclose a workflow management method for creating and delivering output material (see column 1, lines 8-10 and Figures 6A-C for creation of output material), comprising generating a customer record (job profile, see column 9, lines 21-42) to include fields specifying at least one product (product name, see column 10, lines 6-10), customer preferences (output and image condition preferences), and a selected output method to deliver generated output material on the product specified in the customer record (medium name), adding a job record (job profile) including a status field (output state, see column 10, lines 59-64 and Figure 5) to a job status table (job list) for the customer record, setting the job record to a first status, processing a selected job, and invoking a first worker (job picker routine 112) if the selected job has a first status (determine pickable jobs, see Figure 6A-B), generating output material (i.e., image, see column 11, lines 54-55) from processing the product customer preference fields (output and image conditioning preferences) with the first worker (job picker routine 112), setting the status for the selected job to a second status (determine next job to image) after generating the output material with the first worker, and invoking a second worker (job picker routine 112 executes a second pass of pickable jobs to determine the next job to image based upon priority, see Figure 6C). Smith et al '156 does not disclose if the selected job has the second status, determining a selected one of a

plurality of delivery options from the customer record for the selected job, and transmitting the output material via the determined delivery option to the customer to the customer. Smith et al '790 disclose a delivery component 74 (i.e., worker) used to delivery output materials to customer (see Figure 7). Both Smith et al '156 and Smith et al '790 are concerned with the efficient processing of documents, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to include a second worker in Smith et al '156 that determines and transmits the outputted material, thereby effectively combining the functions for the customer, thus employing a more robust system.

As per claim 2, Smith et al '156 disclose accessing at least one content file (media status) by processing a database table (list of media status objects) using values (medium name preference) in the customer record associated with the job, and generating the content of each file into the output material (see column 8, lines 43-50).

As per claim 3, Smith et al '156 disclose processing a template (i.e., applications programming interface, API see column 8, lines 27-30) including queries of records in the database table (list of media status objects), accessing at least one value in a field (medium name) in one customer record (job profile) to include in a query against the database table, and applying the query against the database table to determine a record associated with a file including fields matching the query (verifying medium availability), wherein the accessed file is associated with the determined record (engine manager class used to validate the medium, see column

8, lines 51-56), and wherein generating the content into the output material comprises generating the content from the accessed file into the template (preference stored from API into memory, see column 8, lines 38-41), which forms the output material.

As per claim 4, Smith et al '156 disclose the first status associated with the first worker (job picker routine 112) and the second status associated with the second worker (job picker routine 112), wherein the first and second workers (job picker routine 112) queries the job status table (job list) to access all jobs having the associated status (first status- determine pickable jobs; second status- determine next job to image based upon priority).

As per claim 6, Smith et al '156 disclose a supervisor program (job picker routine 112) that polls the job status table (job list), performs the steps of invoking the first and second workers, and processes every record in the job status table (job list) when performing the polling operation.

As per claim 7, Smith et al '156 disclose a worker transition table (job list) including a plurality of records, each indicating an input worker (job picker routine 112), a completion state, an output worker (job picker routine 112) and output status (see Figure 5), wherein the input worker indicates the worker assigned to process the job, the completion state is a status indicated for the job after the input worker processes the job, the output worker is the worker that processes the job after the input worker and resulting in the completion state (completed job), and the output state is the state to which the job status is set, and wherein the job status table

further indicates a current worker (job picker routine 112) assigned to process the job, wherein setting the status comprises determining from the worker transition table one record having an input worker and completion state matching the current worker and job status, respectively, and setting the status to the output state (Figure 5) and the current worker to the output worker.

As per claim 8, Smith et al '156 disclose invoking the output worker (job picker routine 112 via second pass, see Figure 6C) after setting the job status to the output status.

As per claim 9, Smith et al '156 disclose the worker (job picker routine 112) completely processing the job, and setting the completion status to a state indicating an outcome of processing the job (output state, see Figure 5).

As per claim 10, Smith et al '156 disclose setting the status to a third status after adding the job in the job status table, invoking a data conditioning worker (picker check subroutine, see column 10, lines 59-64) if the status for the job is the third status, processing the customer record to determine whether at least one value satisfies at least one condition, taking corrective actions if the data in the customer record does not satisfy each condition, and setting the status of the job to the first status (determine pickable jobs, see Figure 6A-B) if the data in the customer record satisfies each condition.

As per claim 11, Smith et al '156 disclose an imposition worker and table of contents worker, wherein the supervisor (job picker routine 112) sets the job status to an imposition (hold status), and invokes the imposition and table of contents

workers. Theses statuses and additional workers are simply additional preferences contemplated by Smith et al '156 (see column 10, lines 6-10), therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a table of content status and associated worker in Smith et al '156, thereby making the system more efficient by further distributing the workload.

As per claim 12, Smith et al '156 does not disclose generating information on the output material, setting the status for the job in the job status table to a third status, invoking an accounting worker if the job has a third status, the accounting worker processing the generated information on the output material to determine costs of generating the output material, and generating an invoice. Smith et al '790 disclose an account manager 46 (i.e., worker) used to maintain all account information (see column 6, lines 12-15). Both Smith et al '156 and Smith et al '790 are concerned with the efficient processing of documents, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to include a third status and an accounting worker in Smith et al '156 that is able to determine costs effectively generate an accurate invoice for the customer, thus making the system more robust.

As per claim 13, Smith et al '156 does not disclose multiple workers each associated with one input status and at least one output status, wherein the status of the job is updated to one associated output status after one worker completes processing the job, wherein the output status for one worker is the input status associated with one other worker and wherein the definition of input and output

statuses for workers defines the workflow of the job. Smith et al '156 disclose job picker routine 112, which performs all the functions associated with input ands output status. However, Smith et al '156 also disclose variation on the procedures to yield the same results (see column 10, lines 35-37), which could include using multiple workers, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple workers in the Smith '156 method, thereby increasing the efficiency through division of workload.

Claims (14-17 and 19-26) and (27-30 and 32-39) are rejected based upon the rejections of claims 1-4 and 6-13, since they are the system and article of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the method claims.

6. Claims 5, 18, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (USPN 5,964,156), in view of Smith et al (USPN 5,790,790), as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Marlin et al (USPN 5,778,377).

As per claim 5, Smith et al '156 disclose determining whether an error occurred while processing the job (output error, see Figure 5). Smith et al '156 does not invoke an error worker if the job has the error status, performing error recovery with the error worker, and setting the status of the job to the first and second status after recovery. Marlin et al disclose error recovery procedures implemented by the system manager (i.e., worker) throughout the system (see column 4, lines 1-10). Both Smith et al '156 and Marlin et al are concerned with the effective document management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to include an error worker and recovery in Smith et al '156, as seen in Marlin et al, thereby providing an effective method to resolve any errors in the system that may be effecting the efficiency therein.

Claims 18 and 31 are rejected based upon the rejection of claim 5, since they are the system and article of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the method claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Gryphon et al (USPN 6233537) disclose a modeling system for the visual presentation of business applications.

-Pigos, Jr. et al (USPN 6370521) disclose tracking of job data in a document processing environment.

-Yosefi (USPN 5649220) discloses artwork design and production.

-Petchenkine et al (USPN 6483524) disclose configuring a prepress workflow.

-Bentwich (USPN 6289513) discloses generating an application via components.

-Harris, Jr. et al (USPN 6144975) disclose intelligent document management.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (703) 305-1867. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and After Final communications, and (703) 746-7305 for informal/draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

adb
November 22, 2002

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600